

**Lewis County Planning Commission  
Lewis County Courthouse  
351 NW North St.  
Chehalis, WA 98532**

**August 24, 2010  
Meeting Notes**

**Planning Commissioners Present:** Bill Russell, Mike Mahoney, Bob Guenther, Rachael Jennings

**Planning Commissioners Excused:** Jim Lowery, Richard Tausch, Arny Davis

**County Commissioners Present:** Lee Grose

**Staff Present:** Phillip Rupp, Barbara Kincaid, Glenn Carter, Pat Anderson

**Consultants Present:** Roger Wagoner and Greg Waddell, BHC Consultants

**Handouts/Materials Used:**

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from August 10, 2010
- South Lewis County Subarea Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- Six Year Transportation Improvement Program Unfunded Projects (STIP)
- Letter from Mr. J Vander Stoep re: Forecastle Timber

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Jennings called the meeting to order at 6:59 p.m. The Commissioners introduced themselves.

**II. Old Business**

A. Approval of the meeting notes from August 10, 2010

Chairman Jennings entertained a motion to approve the meeting notes from August 10, 2010.

Commissioner Guenther moved to approve; Commissioner Russell seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

**III. New Business**

Chairman Jennings stated the Commission would go into New Business for the workshop on the Public Works Six Year Transportation Program before starting the workshops on the other topics.

Mr. Mike Kroll, Lewis County Public Works, stated Public Works is required annually to develop and pass a six-year transportation program. Typically Public Works presents the plan to the Planning Commission after it has passed. This year there is a list of unfunded programs and Mr. Kroll is looking for public input on the projects.

Mr. Kroll explained how the projects are chosen. The maintenance managers submit a list, public input is received and permits are looked at for areas of growth. After potential projects are identified they are scored on several criteria and their significance to the safe operation and maintenance to the road system. The characteristics used to evaluate the roads are traffic volumes, traffic accidents, pavement ratings, geographic equity, constructability and permits, maintenance offset, support by other plans and supplemental funding.

Mr. Kroll referred to the handout and stated the upper portion shows road construction projects, which is realigning a road or widening a road and involves tearing up and putting down a new road. The rest of the paper shows the "3 R" projects which are resurfacing, restoration and rehabilitation projects. Those are the projects where the road surface is ground up, cement is mixed in with the grindings and the road is resurfaced without changing the width or adding capacity to the road. This year 3 R projects are being done on Gish Road, Birley Road and Salzer Valley Road.

Mr. Kroll stated there are comment forms that can be filled out and returned to the Public Services Building. The STIP is not approved until November and the comment forms can be received up until that time.

Mr. Kroll asked for questions.

Commissioner Russell asked about the funded projects. Mr. Kroll stated those projects are on the STIP already and can be found on the website. If any of these projects move into the STIP they are scheduled for the fifth or sixth year until they can be funded through a source other than local funding.

Commissioner Russell asked Public Works to keep Covell Creek in mind.

Mr. Kroll stated the Forest Service needs to straighten the right-of-way there in order for Public Works to go forward with that. Commissioner Russell stated it has been funded for some time.

Mr. Kroll has been working with the Forest Service on a grant and he will speak with the engineer to find out if anything is happening with the right-of-way.

## **II. Old Business**

### **B. Workshop on Forecastle Timber property at Mineral Lake**

Mr. Rupp stated the Planning Commission packets included a letter and a map from J Vander Stoep, the attorney representing Forecastle Timber. It represents a change from Application #156 and Mr. Rupp recapped the history of this application.

Originally the application consisted of approximately 2000 acres on the north side of Mineral Lake. The request was to change that acreage from forest resource land of long term commercial significance to forest resource land of local importance. That proposal was last seen by the Planning Commission in 2009. That application, along with several others, was remanded back to the Planning Commission by the BOCC for further review. The review in 2009 resulted in a recommendation which the Planning Commission transmitted to the BOCC to keep the forest resource land of long term commercial significance designation in place. The recommendation was based on the county's understanding of the WAC section 365.190.060 guiding the Lewis County Code chapter 17.30.420 through .430. The fundamental question was whether the designation of forest resource land of long term commercial significance was done in error, whether conditions had changed, or if it meets the criteria of forest resource lands of local importance.

Mr. Rupp explained the difference between the two designations. Forest resource lands of long term commercial significance are those within a minimum block of 5000 contiguous acres and are managed as forest resource. Forest resource lands of local importance are either close to, or have access to, public services, are near an area with a history of land development, or an area where economics affect

the ability of the owner to manage these lands as timber resource and fall outside the 5000 contiguous acre block for forest land.

The local importance designation is only an opt-in category, meaning that the land owners choose to designate their property as forest lands of local importance to allow the property owners, who are not part of a 5000 acre contiguous block, to enjoy the benefits of timber raising and harvest and some of the tax benefits that go along with that. The opt-in for this designation is conditioned by the property owner committing to stay in that designation for at least ten years after which they can opt out.

The designation of forest lands of long term commercial significance is not voluntary. The designation can be placed on property in spite of the property owner's wishes. It should be noted that our code at one time had an opt-out clause in it, however in 2002, section 17.30.550, titled "Application Process for Exclusion from Designation" was repealed suggesting that the rulings from the Growth Board and interpretations of the RCWs and WAC the criteria for designating forest resource lands of long term commercial significance were either met or not met and the only rationale for removing land from long term commercial significance was that an error was made or conditions had changed.

That brings us to the current application. The letter from Mr. Vander Stoep presents a modified application, reducing significantly the property to be changed from long term commercial significance to local importance, from about 2000 acres to 800 acres. The question fundamental to this request is the same as it was in 2009: Does the property meet the definition in our Comprehensive Plan, the Lewis County Code and the WAC of forest resource lands of long term commercial significance or of forest lands of local importance? The information that staff received as a revised application consisted of the letter and attached map. There was no argument that was included that addressed the issues that existed in 2009 and continue to exist today.

The attorney representing Forecastle Timber is here tonight and can present the case at the Good of the Order if he wishes to do so.

Mr. Rupp asked if there were questions from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Russell stated he is quite familiar with that property and asked if anything has changed on that hillside other than the ownership.

Mr. Rupp stated to his knowledge there have been no changes.

Commissioner Russell has re-read the decision that was made and he does not see where an error was made. Chairman Jennings agreed. Commissioner Russell suggesting waiting on this until there is input at the public hearing.

Mr. Rupp stated that is how the other rezone requests were handled.

Commissioner Guenther remembered that the highway that goes through the forest land is actually considered a border that splits the contiguous acreage of that land. The highway has been there for many, many years and he does not think anything has changed.

Commissioner Russell stated the highway does not split the 5000 acres, either Hwy 7 or the highway to Mt. Rainier.

Mr. Rupp stated there was discussion about a railroad through there, also.

Commissioner Mahoney stated at the last meeting there was a discussion about a public hearing in Mineral. He asked if that has been set. Mr. Rupp stated not at this time and it will be pursued if that is the Planning Commission's desire.

Commissioner Mahoney stated we need to keep in mind the property owner's desires and rights to deal with their own property. The one thing that has changed dramatically in the last several years is the health and economy running the forest products industry in this county. At one time a lot of timber ground may have been a good investment. Today the forestry owners are looking at alternative sources of income in order to maintain their property. We need to go into this with an open mind and regardless of GMA restrictions, Commissioner Mahoney thinks property rights are something we must be very cognizant of and be very careful with.

Commissioner Jennings stated the other Commissioners would probably not disagree with that but they have to go with the criteria that are in the WAC, and that criteria do not look at the personal side of the matter.

Commissioner Mahoney wants to go into this with an open mind and listen to the testimony that is presented.

C. 2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop on South County Subarea Plan and Toledo UGA

Ms. Kincaid introduced Mr. Roger Wagoner and Greg Waddell from BHC who have done a lot of work on the Subarea Plan.

At the last meeting Ms. Kincaid presented a PowerPoint on what has happened so far to create the Subarea Plan. Tonight she would like to go over the Plan for economic development and it will go with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The letter included in the packet explains the process.

The Toledo UGA proposal that is shown on the agenda will not be discussed this evening; it will be moved to September 14. Staff wanted to keep these two items together because Toledo is in the planning area and the city of Toledo has been a partner in putting the Subarea Plan together.

Ms. Kincaid put up large maps that are duplicated in the packet if anyone would like to look at those.

Ms. Kincaid stated 27 steering committee meetings and two open houses have been held during the past couple of years, as well as sub-committee meetings. This is a partnership of the Cowlitz Indian Tribal housing, the cities of Vader, Toledo and Winlock, the EDC, the Public Facilities District, Ed Carlson Memorial Airport, the South Lewis County Chamber, and Lewis County.

As you read through the Plan there are documents referenced and those represent a lot of the other work elements that went into the Plan.

The Plan has been presented to the Planned Growth Committee which is standard procedure when the county has urban growth area proposals or county policy changes. The PGC gave it a thumbs' up and forwarded it to the Planning Commission for review.

The Planning Commission will workshop the Plan and hold a public hearing and the BOCC will also hold a public hearing. Letters will be sent to the property owners that are in the areas where there are proposed land use designation changes. The documents are on the website and they will also go to the public libraries and senior centers.

Ms. Kincaid anticipated a workshop on September 14 but the agenda for that day is quite full. The rezone recommendations will be discussed that day and Ms. Kincaid asked if the Planning Commission would prefer to workshop the Plan that day or schedule a separate meeting. Discussion followed and it was decided to have a special meeting on Wednesday, September 15 at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioner Russell noted there were no comment letters in the packet that was received. He asked if there have been no comment letters or if they were incorporated into the document.

Ms. Kincaid stated so far the comments have been incorporated. The Planning Commission will be seeing comment letters from people who support it or those who do not support it. She has been presenting the Plan to the cities and the Winlock School District indicated it will be sending a support letter.

The Steering Committee asked if the public hearing could be held in Toledo at the St. Mary's Center on Wednesday, September 29 which is the day after the Planning Commission's regularly scheduled meeting. There were no objections.

Commissioner Russell asked if there was a cost to holding the meeting in Toledo. Ms. Kincaid stated St. Mary's has never charged the County for the use of their facility. They have been an excellent partner.

Ms. Kincaid stated on October 12 staff will present the draft Letter of Transmittal anticipating that your recommendation will go to the BOCC for its public hearing on November 1.

That is the schedule for the adoption of the Plan. Ms. Kincaid alluded that the draft EIS follows a little different course. The DEIS will go with the Plan because staff believes that people who want to comment on the DEIS need to have the Plan to understand what their concerns are. We have run through the environmental schedule, including publishing the scoping notice and threshold of determination, held a scoping meeting, collected comments on the proposal of the scope of the EIS, and we are now issuing this draft EIS. A notice of availability will go in the East County Journal and the Chronicle next week that will begin the 30-day comment period.

We would like to use the public hearing as an opportunity to collect comments and staff will pull out those that are specific to the DEIS and respond to those accordingly.

The Plan is a comprehensive plan and it has the elements and chapters that address all the things that we need to do in our comprehensive planning. Ms. Kincaid asked if there were questions or discussion; otherwise she had the high points she thought should be covered.

Chairman Jennings suggested she proceed with the high points.

Ms. Kincaid stated the policy statements on pages 1-4 through 1-6 are important. She did not anticipate discussion tonight since there was not a lot of time for the Commissioners to study the document.

The Environmental Protection recommendations on pages 3-7 through 3-8 need to be looked at and the Land Use and Economic Development chapter is important since 793 acres will be considered for more intense urban uses. The committee alternative map and the proposed UGA maps are areas where we are proposing changing the land use designation.

Also being proposed is an urban reserve area which does not change its land use designation or zoning, rather, it attempts to put some protection device in place so sub-divisions will not be occurring. Currently it is zoned RDD-20. Pages 4-9 through 4-11 explain the proposed land use changes. The implementation is also important because we will be introducing some comprehensive amendment proposals to the text and those will support the Subarea Plan.

The Capital Facilities is a working document and a lot of background work has been done. There is the potential for that to change as the cities and county continue to work on an alternative option for regional facilities.

Mr. Wagoner stated this is something the county is inventing. Up to now the Planning Commission has dealt with UGAs with respect to cities' requests and they have been tied to population and residential increases. There are no provisions for the creation of major urban growth areas specifically designed to accommodate new industrial and major regional retail types of uses. All Lewis County cities are constrained in being able to accommodate the large land-taking uses. What you will see in the Land Use and Economic Development element is a survey of available industrial land, or a summary of what we know of available industrial land throughout the county. We have concluded that there are no areas in the county where an outside developer looking for 100+ acres can locate. That was the basis for the economic market analysis and to provide the information for what the future holds for that potential in the county. We worked through the land use analysis to ensure we did not designate any sites or areas that have conflicts. We stayed away from the Agricultural Resource Lands, we stayed away from the known major environmental features, and we came up with the sites that are good land, generally undeveloped, they contain large parcels, they are approximate to good access and the steering committee was very agreeable to this conclusion.

Commissioner Russell mentioned the city of Ridgefield. It has been very successful and he had the opportunity to talk to a potential investor who was considering building a distribution center in Lewis County. They did not because they could not have 125 acres of clear land.

Commissioner Mahoney stated similar concerns were discussed when the Planning Commission looked at north Centralia. He is glad to see planning being done years in advance. If we don't do the planning now when the time comes when the large industries want to come in we won't be able to attract them. He stated there were a lot of stakeholders involved for a couple of years and asked if there have been any significant concerns raised about this process, such as flooding along the Cowlitz.

Mr. Wagoner stated the group tried to select lands that would not be encumbered by issues such as flooding. Probably the most controversial issue was a concern from people who live near the Ed Carlson Memorial Airport that the Plan would result in an expansion of the airport. There is a separate planning process to look at the airport. In this Plan, you will see nothing about expansion of the airport.

Commissioner Mahoney stated something that has been mentioned is maintaining the rural character of the area. It is inevitable that there will be some changes and he would like to see it stay near I-5 and out

of the flood plain and minimize the traffic impact away from I-5. It is important to recognize those concerns and know that they have been dealt with.

Mr. Wagoner stated an unscientific on-line survey was conducted and about 100 responses were received. There was a strong consensus for the preservation of the rural character and our approach for land use zoning controls is development occurring in these areas under a binding site plan process. This is a very detailed master planning effort in which the county has the ability to control things such as perimeter buffers adjacent to rural lands, traffic flow, etc, and this is the most effective way to move into the development of these sites.

Commissioner Guenther stated in his opinion Lewis County is not for sale cheap and its labor is not for sale cheap. Today there are people who think that \$31,200 is a good wage. It is not a good wage. We should go on notice that we are not in the business of bringing people in to live on those kinds of wages to support our community. We cannot build a strong community if we don't demand that companies who come in can pay a decent wage.

Ms. Kincaid called the Commission's attention to the Vision Statement. This statement captures what the people who wrote it want their community to look like, such as protecting the rural character and environment and providing jobs that will pay enough for a good quality of life. These are the foundations of how these policies were developed and eventually support the regulations that will make the vision work.

Commissioner Russell asked everyone to keep in mind that once we get into the binding site plans, etc, he wants to make sure there is no burden put on the taxpayers. The brunt of the cost should stay with the developers.

Ms. Kincaid stated the Legislature recognized that this was an important project and it actually funded the first phase of work performed by the county and the state agencies to develop the habitat and watershed characterization reports. We have a lot of support and recognition that there is a need for economic opportunities in developing this Plan.

Ms. Kincaid invited the Commissioners and audience to look at the large maps that were on display.

Commissioner Guenther stated it would be helpful if the borders of the subarea and the cities were pointed out, along with major highways.

Mr. Waddell pointed out the cities and their UGAs, Cardinal Glass, the economic development UGAs which are not attached to any city, and the areas set aside as urban reserve.

Commissioner Mahoney asked if there are provisions to get the economic UGAs zoned for industrial use and restrict residential zoning in those areas. Ms. Kincaid stated there are provisions for that.

Mr. Wagoner stated the UGA at I-5 would be designated regional retail commercial/tourism. That would be where major hotels, event facilities and entertainment facilities would locate. The one at Jackson Highway would be primarily industrial.

Mr. Waddell stated the parcel sizes of those two areas lend themselves to those types of uses.

Ms. Kincaid stated the Hovee Report showed the land demand in acreage that we could use and the industrial acreage that could be supported in South County did not include the Winlock UGA. A subject of the steering committee was where infrastructure needs could be invested to serve the UGAs. The Winlock UGA stands alone and is not competing with the rest of the proposal.

Mr. Rupp added that there will be a cost to the county and citizens in terms of infrastructure investment; however those investments will have tremendous payoffs in jobs and tax returns.

Commissioner Guenther mentioned the area south of Puyallup to Eatonville and stated that has become a solid strip mall in the last 30 years. He asked for confirmation that what we are doing in this plan is keeping the Jackson Highway from becoming the same type of development.

Ms. Kincaid stated he is correct.

Mr. Wagoner stated the process that will be brought to the Planning Commission with the zoning information is going to show how big projects get done in a sensitive way, how they pay their own way and how they are phased, so they will not over-stress the county's ability to deal with them. There may be county investment provided to help make an incentive for those projects to happen and will be rolled into the whole master planning process.

Mr. Waddell stated although it is only briefly mentioned in the plan, we are looking at development techniques where we can provide incentives for developers. As a trade-off for those incentives we would get conservation easements or purchase of development rights in the areas that are identified by DOE and WDFW as being sensitive habitat areas. It's a win-win situation because the developers will be able to more economically develop and at the same time in perpetuity preserve some of the areas that are identified as priority habitat areas.

Ms. Kincaid stated on the social side of this and how the people on the steering committee feel about the rural character and the natural beauty of where they live, there was a sense of concern and expediency that if this planning work was not done we may end up in the situation that Commissioner Guenther mentioned. We may be overrun because of the strategic location of the I-5 corridor and the fact that this is an area that is largely undeveloped and one of the few that is left. The impetus to get the plan in place and allow the community to make these decisions rather than have growth occur for them was a very important part of the discussions.

Commissioner Mahoney stated Highway 7 out of Tacoma is very unattractive. If you go into north Lacey there is a large industrial park with several large buildings. A block away you are unaware it is there and it does not detract from the local area at all. With proper planning in advance, the area along the Jackson Highway could be developed into something very beneficial to all the people and not detracting from the closest neighbors. He thanked everyone involved for all their hard work on this planning.

Commissioner Russell agreed with the other commissioners. What he has seen of the plan looks great and he appreciates the long-term planning that went into it.

#### **IV. Calendar**



The next meeting will be on September 14 and will include the recommendations on the rezones and the first workshop on the Countywide Planning Policies and population allocations and Toledo UGA expansion.

Commissioner Russell asked if the letter of transmittal would be prepared for the September 14 meeting. Mr. Rupp stated the September 14 meeting will be a workshop on the rezones and an overview of the discussions about the rezone applications. After that review the Planning Commission will set a public hearing and at that time the recommendations will be transmitted to the BOCC.

Commissioner Mahoney asked what the schedule is to get everything to the BOCC.

Mr. Rupp stated this will be part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment and some extra meetings may be required. That may depend on how the public hearings go on the rezones. At the next meeting staff will have a calendar for the public hearings.

#### **V. Good of the Order**

Mr. J Vander Stoep was representing the applicant and land owners of the Mineral property. He stated he appreciated very much the time and consideration the Planning Commissioners gave to the issues brought to them and he appreciates staff's time on this particular proposal.

Mr. Vander Stoep stated the entire property was re-surveyed and is in 80 to 81-acre parcels and the parcels when possible take advantage of coming down to the lake. The owners have drilled wells in the past few months and if the property is not re-zoned those parcels will be sold and in time people will probably build vacation homes on the property. The choice is not between keeping development off of the property, but what the makeup is.

The proposal is setting aside about 1600 acres and the owners have said by deed that they would keep it in permanent forest reserve so it could never be developed for housing.

If this revised proposal is accepted the property is not open to the public, but in reality people do go onto it and the owners have no objection if people are respectful. If, on the other hand, the land remains as it is currently zoned and the lots are sold as 80's there is no guarantee that the 1600 acres will later have land owners on it that will prevent the public from hunting and hiking.

Currently, because of the favorable property tax for timberland, the owners pay about \$6000 a year in property taxes for 2300 acres. If this rezone is approved, and over time people buy the lots by the lake, most likely those properties would generate each \$10,000 a year in property taxes, which is a benefit to the school districts, fire districts and the county.

Mr. Vander Stoep wanted to clarify his earlier comment about the highway splitting the property. He was trying to say that the highway on one side and the railroad on the other separate the property from the thousands of acres of forest land on both sides. The point we were making under "contiguous" is under Lewis County Code which states that if a road or railroad runs through property it is not a contiguous lot, it becomes two lots. Mr. Vander Stoep is contending this lot is not contiguous under the reading of the code with the rest of the forest land to the east and to the west.

Mr. Vander Stoep went on to say that the code requires and demands that the county accepts this application. It does not. The code is unclear; the code requires judgment calls. The code does not

prohibit the county, either. It is a discretionary question and it comes to questions such as: Is it close to other development? There is the development in the community of Mineral immediately adjacent to the south side of this property and that is the side under this modified proposal that we are asking to be changed. Another question is whether anything has changed. There has been a change. There is a fairly substantial development adjoining the northwest part of the property. Mineral is changing and slowly developing. The area that we are asking to be rezoned is near that area of change. None of the lots have been sold yet but the question under the code is not whether that lot has changed, but whether the area around it has changed, and the area around it is slowly changing.

The property owners are not seeking to move this land out of a forest resource land designation. The county code said local importance land and long term commercial significance are both forest resource lands. That isn't exactly what the GMA says but the time for challenging the county code in this regard is past.

Mr. Vander Stoep stated his client has tried to be responsive to the concerns that were raised last year and have presented a much revised proposal from last year. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak.

Commissioner Guenther stated he did a little math and it appears that 80 acres would be 26 lots versus the 34 that is proposed.

Mr. Ed Brown, Fire Commissioner District 9, stated about 1600 acres of the 2300 acres are not in Lewis County District 9's domain. That would need to be annexed in order to receive service and that would also annex the other timber holdings that are around the fire district. Those are fire preserved properties which pay no fire tax. They pay an EMS tax. A cap has been put on the tax and everyone will be paying about \$4.25 per piece of property. The 80 acre parcels will be outside of the fire protection district.

There is a unified fire code, article 9, that requires fire access, which Mr. Brown described. There is only one entrance. The former owner did not want to reconstruct the road and approached the fire district and asked the fire district to waive the requirement and they would mitigate to the district \$50,000. The fire commission and Chief turned the offer down. That \$50,000 is close to the district's annual budget.

Mr. Brown spoke of the costs of buying equipment and stated \$50,000 would not provide a mitigated amount to do anything that would provide anything extra for the new area. He stated the new fire truck is designed for asphalt roadways. If we cannot provide fire protection in that area we will notify the County Commissioners. Because of the elevation there are times when the fire department cannot get up the hill.

Mr. Brown stated changing the zoning would not change the tax base unless there is a house on it, and only after the house is able to be occupied does the tax start.

Mr. Brown stated if this proposal has been going on since last year, this is the first time he has heard about it. The fire district would like to be a good neighbor it doesn't want to come into it at the end of the game.

Mr. Rupp reminded everyone that tonight's meeting is not a public hearing and continued participation will be necessary at the public hearings. At that time the comments become part of the official record.

Mr. Ron Nilson stated he lives close to the entrance to the 2200 acres. He understands there is a conservancy group that might be interested in buying the land in question and if it does then we are free of a mess for the county and a mess for the people in Mineral.

Mr. Nilson provided a copy of a letter to the Planning Commission that he wrote to the BOCC. He is opposed to the development of the property at Mineral Lake and went through his reasons which included the possibility of zoning becoming more intense in the future, the pollution to the lake, the effects on the local community and public services, the impacts to roads, water and sewer and animals. Developing close to the lake will eliminate the public use of the lake for swimming. He is concerned that wells might hinder the flow of water into the creek and the lake and have a negative effect on the springs in the area.

Mr. Nilson stated it is not known who is going to manage the forest reserve land and he hopes that will be addressed in the proposal as it will have a bearing on the validity of what Mr. Vander Stoep said.

Mr. Nilson has requested a public hearing in Mineral and has not gotten a response yet. He stated there are places to meet in Mineral.

This proposal has the potential of environmental and ecological damage to the lake and rivers. It will double or triple the size of the town, changing it to a bedroom community for people in Seattle and Tacoma.

Chairman Jennings stated a public hearing is planned for the Mineral area and encouraged testimony to be given at that time.

Mr. Sam Woody owns property within 600 feet of the UGA proposed at SR 505 and Jackson Hwy. He addressed a comment made by one of the commissioners as to why there were no public comments on file. He believes the reason there are no comments are on file is because the property owners in that area have never received any notification of the proposal. He learned about the meeting through a City Hall meeting last week. He stated the proposal will have a long-term impact on the properties that are already developed in that area. It needs to be brought to the property owners' attention.

Commissioner Guenther stated he believes it is important to hold two meetings so people have the opportunity to participate. There has never been intent to keep this under the radar but people will have the opportunity to comment at the public hearings.

Ms. Sharon White asked if property owners are being affected by the planning how are they notified of what is going on if they don't read the Chronicle or have access to the internet. She has heard at other meetings that people do not know what is going on.

Mr. Rupp stated for various land use cases that involve the Hearing Examiner, for example, the county posts the property. In instances like this it might be a good idea to put signs out in the South County area. An up-to-date calendar is kept on the website, materials are sent to the senior centers and libraries and notices go into the newspapers. There has been a lot of outreach, especially in the South

County area through groups like the South Lewis County Chamber and by word of mouth. Inevitably someone does not get informed but we made an effort to reach as many people as possible.

Chairman Jennings stated this is the second time this has come before the Planning Commission. The planning part was a separate process through Community Development.

Ms. Roberta Church stated the Chronicle is not delivered to Mineral any more.

Mr. Rupp stated the official newspaper of the county is the East County Journal and the notices go into both newspapers.

Chairman Jennings stated public meeting notices also go to the senior centers and libraries, which is part of the code requirement.

Ms. Kincaid stated the South Lewis County Chamber publishes a newsletter and has volunteered to put notices in that publication and with the participation of the cities and the Cowlitz Indian Tribal Housing we will do more than the required notification.

In response to a question, Mr. Rupp stated staff will bring some possible public hearing dates to the Planning Commission on September 14 and it will determine when the hearings [for Mineral Lake] will be held.

Commissioner Russell suggested that Mr. Nilson could be the contact person for the Mineral area so when word needs to get out there is a source.

Chairman Jennings stated we do need a location for the meeting and Mr. Nilson can give his contact information to Community Development.

## **VI. Adjourn**

There was no other business before the Planning Commission and adjournment was at 8:49 p.m.